



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/852,581      | 05/10/2001  | James L. Warmus      | 27600/M239A         | 6089             |

29471            7590            04/01/2003

MCCRACKEN AND FRANK  
200 W. ADAMS STREET  
SUITE 2150  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HONG, STEPHEN S

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2178

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                          |                                      |                                      |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | Application No.<br><b>09/852,581</b> | Applicant(s)<br><b>Warmus et al.</b> |
|                          | Examiner<br><b>Stephen Hong</b>      | Art Unit<br><b>2178</b>              |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephen Hong

(3) Bill McCracken (Applicant's Representative)

(2) Manisha Wuls (Applicant's Representative)

(4) Mark Dreyer (Applicant)

Date of Interview Mar 25, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic      b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes    e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:  
de Heus et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discusses the differences between the Applicant's invention and the prior art. Discussed different ways to clarify the differences in the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

STEPHEN HONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2178

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.